

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------------|
| Penland Financial Services, Inc.; and |) | |
| Charles W. Penland, Sr., #12904-171 |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | C.A. No. 6:08-3864-HMH-WMC |
| |) | |
| vs. |) | OPINION & ORDER |
| |) | |
| Select Financial Services, LLC; Ken |) | |
| Anthony; Jean Bradley; Clement Broncale; |) | |
| Acorn Capitol Group, LLC, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge William M. Catoe, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.¹ Charles W. Penland, Sr. (“Penland”), proceeding pro se, filed the instant complaint alleging that Defendants wrongfully took assets of Penland Financial Services, Inc. without paying for the assets and thereby breaching a contract. In his Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Catoe recommends dismissing Penland’s complaint.

Penland filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party’s right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (2006).

accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Penland's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Catoe's Report and Recommendation.

It is therefore

ORDERED that Penland's pro se complaint, docket number 1, is dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
December 18, 2008

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.